

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-7 were previously canceled.

Claims 8 and 14 have been amended.

The amendment of Claim 8 is supported by nozzle 65 in Figs. 6D and 7B, nozzle 95 in Fig. 8D, nozzle 125 in Fig. 9G, nozzle 155 in Fig. 10E, and nozzle 195 in Fig. 11F. The amendment of Claim 14 is supported by the corresponding claim as previously presented and the specification at page 11..

No new matter has been added by the present amendments.

REMARKS

Claims 8-14 are pending in the present application.

The objection to the Abstract and the objection to the drawings are believed to be obviated by the submission of the substitute Abstract and replacement drawings herewith.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these grounds of objection.

The rejection of Claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is believed to be obviated by amendment.

The Examiner has indicated that the term “overhanging” is unclear and, as such, adopts a definition not at all based on the relevant technology, but rather based on Merriam-Webster’s dictionary to mean “to project over”. Applicants submit that this interpretation is improper and not consistent with the present specification. Based on nozzle 65 in Figs. 6D and 7B, nozzle 95 in Fig. 8D, nozzle 125 in Fig. 9G, nozzle 155 in Fig. 10E, and nozzle 195 in Fig. 11F, Claim 8 has been amended to clarify that “the electronebulization nozzle comprising a channel wherein said electronebulization nozzle forms a cantilever end relative to the support such that the channel is parallel to the support”. Claim 14 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis problem.

Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

The rejections of: (a) Claims 8-14 (intended to be Claims 8-10 based on the lack of enunciated grounds of rejection in paragraph 7, as well as the statement in paragraph 11) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Jedrzejewski et al and (b) Claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Jedrzejewski et al in view of Yobas et al, are respectfully traversed.

Jedrzejewski et al disclose a microfluidic device comprising microfluidic channels (discharge portions 226(c)) forming the end of the transfer-separation channels 226. Each discharge portion 226(c) terminates in a nozzle 227 (see Fig. 27 and paragraph [0151]). Fig. 27 shows that the discharge portions 226(c) are perpendicular to the main portion of the transfer-separation channel 226.

However, notably the device disclosed by Jedrzejewski et al does not prevent dead volumes due to changes in direction (see the present specification at page 9, lines 16-20). To solve the problem of dead volumes, the presently claimed device comprises a fluidic network realized in a thin layer integral with a support, the fluidic network terminating in a channel realized in an electronebulization nozzle overhanging (that is forming a cantilevered end) relative to the support. With this arrangement, the channel is parallel to the support and dead volumes are prevented.

Further, the Examiner allegedly equates the microanalysis chip 200 to a thin layer. Specifically, the Examiner points to microanalysis chip 200 as a layer fixed by direct sealing onto the support. Applicants disagree. There is nothing in paragraph [0155] to support this position. Instead, members 200 and 100 are associated as those of Figs. 25 and 26 (see the gap between members 200 and 100 in Fig. 27) by interposing a seal member references 253 in Fig. 26 (see paragraph [0154]).

Thus, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Jedrzejewski et al, even when combined with Yobas et al. Withdrawal of

these grounds of rejection is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 50,552

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)